ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----X
CHANEL, INC.,

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOCUMENT
PA' FILE 9/20/23

Plaintiff,

- against -

18 Civ. 2253 (LLS)

IN LIMINE ORDER

WGACA, LLC, WHAT COMES AROUND GOES AROUND LLC d/b/a WHAT GOES AROUND COMES AROUND, MHW PROPERTIES, INC., WGACA WEB, LLC, PINES VINTAGE, INC., VINTAGE DESIGNS LTD., and WCAGA LA, LLC,

Defendants.										
_	_	_	_	_	-	_	Serve	-	_	_Y

The Parties' Motions in Limine are resolved as follows:

Chanel's Motions in Limine:

- Chanel No. 1 (Dkt. No. 310): The Motion in Limine is denied because direct proof may not be the only way of persuading a fact-finder that Chanel made the Chanel-branded items.
- Chanel No. 2 (Dkt. No. 312): The Motion in Limine is denied because evidence of WGACA's own processes is admissible whether or not the fact-finder finds that they have enough documentation.
- Chanel No. 3 (Dkt. No. 314): The Motion in Limine is denied because Plaintiff's concerns can be adequately handled on cross-examination, and Mr. Weisser has personal knowledge

- of WGACA's business practices.
- Chanel No. 4 (Dkt. No. 316): The Motion in Limine is granted because the evidence regarding Chanel's motives will provide no help in deciding the trial disputes over claims that WGACA infringed Chanel's trademarks.
- Chanel No. 5 (Dkt. No. 318): The Motion in Limine is denied because the evidence is germane to the issues in the case.
- Chanel No. 6 (Dkt. No. 320): The Motion in Limine is granted under Federal Rule of Evidence 403.

WGACA's Motions in Limine:

- WGACA No. 1 (Dkt. No. 297): The Motion in Limine is denied because the Lanham Act is a law act, disgorgement is a law remedy, and counterfeit is a law concept.
- WGACA No. 2 (Dkt. No. 298): The decision is reserved for trial.
- WGACA No. 3 (Dkt. No. 299): The Motion in Limine is denied because Defendants' concerns can be adequately handled on cross-examination. However, there shall be no reference, direct or indirect, by any party, witness, lawyer, or trial participant to Rockwell Automation, Inc. v. Radwell Int'l, Inc., No. 1:15-cv-05246-RBK-JS (D.N.J.).
- WGACA No. 4 (Dkt. No. 300): The decision is reserved for trial.

Case 1:18-cv-02253-LLS Document 361 Filed 09/20/23 Page 3 of 3

- WGACA No. 5 (Dkt. No. 301): The decision is reserved for trial.
- WGACA No. 6 (Dkt. No. 302): The decision is reserved for trial.

Dated: New York, New York

September 20 2023

LOUIS L. STANTON

U.S.D.J.